DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 319 503 PS 018 786

AUTHOR	Vandenberghe, R.; Leuven, K. U.
TITLE	Symposium on "Experiences of Innovation in Primary Education in the Netherlands" (Noordwijkerhout, Netherlands, October 24-28, 1988). The CDCC's Project No. 8: "Innovation in Primary Education."
INSTITUTION	Council for Cultural Cooperation, Strasbourg (France).
REPORT NO	DECS/EGT(88)73
PUB DATE	12 Dec 89
NOTE	66p.; For related documents, see ED 315 173-175 and PS 018 785.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Adjustment (to Environment); Cooperation; *Educational Change; *Educational Development; *Educational Innovation; Educational Responsibility; Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; Foreign Countries; *Primary Education; Program Evaluation; Self Evaluation (Groups); Teacher Responsibility; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	*Netherlands; Teacher Commitment

ABSTRACT

Educators from Holland and member countries of the Council of Europe attended a symposium on innovation in primary education in the Netherlands. Much of the discussion was based on the evaluation report, "Lessons from Practice: the Primary Education Act Reviewed." Participants evaluated initial, partial research results, and compared Dutch developments with those in other member states. Discussions allowed participants to exchange information about the processes of innovation in primary education in member states. Participants also discussed experiences with the dissemination of the results of the Council of Europe's Council for Cultural Cooperation's project on innovation in primary education. Working groups discussed six principles concerning decentralization of responsibility, commitment of school and teachers to innovation, organizational issues in education, creation of an intermediate level of organization with no power, self-evaluation at the school level, and time factors in planned change. This report of proceedings provides symposium aims and proceedings, background information, a summary of group reports, and material on a report on implementation of the primary education act. Appendices include the program, a list of participants, and reports of working groups. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED319503

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

COUNCIL OF EUROPE

CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

DECS/EGT (88) 73

Project No. 8 of the CDCC
"Innovation in primary education"

Symposium on "Experiences of innovation in primary education in the Netherlands"

Noordwijkerhout, 24-28 October 1988

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Council of Europe
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PS 018786

Council for Cultural Co-operation

Strasbourg 1990

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Strasbourg 12 December 1989 DECS/EGT (88) 73
ADECSEGT73.88

COUNCIL FOR CULTURAL CO-OPERATION (CDCC)

Project No. 8 on
"Innovation in primary education"

Symposium on

"Experiences of innovation in primary education in the Netherlands"

Noordwijkerhout, 24-28 October 1988

General Report

by

Prof. R Vandenberghe
K U Leuven
Centre for Educational
Policy and Innovation

School Education Division
Strasbourg
1989

1. Aims of the Symposium

In 1985, the aims of the New Primary School, as well as the basic principles of the innovation process, were laid down in the Primary Education Act. The act itself is to some extent the result of a twelve year period during which experiments and projects were carried out to explore the integrated primary school.

In 1988, the Dutch authorities wanted to review and to evaluate the results of the innovation process after three years. So, the main part of the discussions during the symposium was based on the evaluation report Lessons from practice: the Primary Education Act reviewed. In her opening statement, the Secretary of State for Education and Science, Mrs Drs N J Ginhaar-Maas, commented upon this document: she highlighted future trends in the relationship between school and society and analysed the problems encountered in the implementation of the Primary Education Act and possible solutions - not by abandoning the objectives, but by modifying the rhythm and methods of introducing the innovations advocated. She also stressed the importance of the schools as autonomous entities in launching changes.

Participants evaluated the first (partial) research results and compared Dutch developments with developments in the member states.

In her address, the Council of Europe representative, Mrs G Podestà, emphasized the exceptional nature and the paradigmatic value of the Netherlands authorities' initiative, which aimed at associating the CDCC's member states in such a politically delicate operation as the evaluation of the functioning of a national law. She stressed the "cross fertilisation" between the underlying philosophy of two CDCC's projects - No. 7 on "The Education and Cultural Development of Migrants" and No. 8 on "Innovation in Primary Education" - and the principles enshrined in several provisions of the above-mentioned Act.

Related to this first aim of the symposium, there was a second one: exchange of information about the on-going processes of innovation in primary education in the member states. During the group discussions, the participants made very interesting and useful remarks based on several national developments and experiences.

Thirdly, it was expected that the participants exchanged experiences on the dissemination of the results of Project No. 8 of the Council of Europe's Council for Cultural Co-operation (the "CDCC") on "Innovation in Primary Education". During the symposium the representatives of the different member states gave an overview of the dissemination activities developed in their country (see Appendix 4 to this report).

2. Proceedings and background information

The main document for this symposium, Lessons from practice: the Primary Education Act reviewed, was prepared by the Ministry of Education on the basis of reports by the Education Inspectorate, the survey carried out by the Pedagogical Research Institute of the University of Groningen and on the research planning study drawn up by the Foundation for Educational Research (SVO). This document not only

gives a good overview of the Primary Education Act itself and the related policy and activities, it also presents a review of the main evaluation results. This report was considered by all the participants as a very valuable instrument for discussions during the symposium and as a very interesting resource for discussions in their own country.

The lectures by Drs G H Van den Hoven ("Experiences of innovation in primary education in the Netherlands"), Prof. N A J Lagerweij ("Educational development policy and school policy") and by Prof. L M Stevens ("Broadening of brief in regular education as a question of definition") gave more background information to the data and facts presented in the evaluation report.

Although in each presentation several particular problems and questions were raised, there was one common problem brought to the attention of the participants. The Primary Education Act provides only a loose framework as a guideline for the development of the new primary school. The main question is then how to improve the quality of the educational system without disturbing the balance between the central policy and the decentralised responsibility at the local school level. In other words, under which conditions can schools develop their own policy that permits them to implement the main goals of the New Primary School in a locally adapted way, but which also fits in the framework of the central policy.

In order to structure the discussions in the working groups Dr. D Kopmels presented six principles. These six principles can be considered as six "advanced organisers" or guidelines for the participants.

Principle 1 concerns the question how to create effective links between the different levels of the educational system. The policy makers, who have the ultimate responsibility, have to make the general decisions. But at the school level these general decisions should be translated into specific activities adapted to the local culture and possibilities of the school and the teaching staff.

Principle 2 is related to one of the main determinants of a successful school and a successful implementation of the aims of the New Primary School. The commitment of the school and the teachers is a necessary prerequisite for school improvement. This necessary commitment can be achieved by stimulating teachers to co-operate. According to this second principle, co-operation among teachers is the most efficient and effective way to deal with the complexities of a large-scale innovation.

But changing the primary school is more than choosing a new content (principle 3). It is also necessary to pay attention to the fit between the new curriculum and some important organisational issues. In other words: in a school improvement project that aims at changes in the content of the curriculum, attention must also be paid to changes in other zones necessary for a successful innovation process, such as: co-operation among teachers; organisation of internal and external support activities, collaboration with parents; etc.

As in most large-scale innovation projects in West European countries, there is a need for an intermediate level without power (principle 4). In other words: between the national authorities and the teachers at the local school level, there is a need for an intermediate level to care for the translation of centrally made decisions into practical teaching activities, to support the schools in their school-based improvement work and to prevent schools from re-inventing the wheel.

Principle 5, on "self evaluation as the guardian angel of school improvement", can be considered as a corollary of the other principles. If activities at the school and the classroom level are considered as the core of the innovation policy and process and if schools and teachers are responsible for the local development, then teachers should be able to evaluate their innovation process and the results. So, self-evaluation becomes a necessity for all schools involved in the innovation process.

Given the broad definition of the aims of the New Primary School and taken into consideration the many specific difficulties at the school level, it is very obvious that "planned change takes time" (principle 6). How can national priorities be translated (see principle 4) at the school level in a way that positive experiences and visible results become possible?

3. Summary of the group reports

In this section attention will be paid to the main results of the discussions in the working groups. The summary is structured around the six above-mentioned principles.

Principle 1: level of responsibility

According to the participants there is a tendency, also in other countries, to install a more decentralised policy on educational matters and to enhance a wider responsibility for schools and municipalities to put the general (national) guidelines into practice. Decentralisation enhances the chances for real changes at the school and at the classroom level.

But the process of decentralisation and the creation of an increased local responsibility should be implemented gradually. According to some participants the Dutch strategy emphasizes too much the power of the local school. There are some doubts about the strategic value of the local school work plan. Some participants believe that a national model curriculum, supported by good basic textbooks, is an alternative solution for an effective linkage between the central authorities and the schools.

In other words, the combination of a top-down strategy and a bottom-up strategy creates some favourable conditions for the schools, but also some problems. It was felt that the demotivation of the teachers, as it was reported in the evaluation report, could be the result of too high expectations towards the teaching staff. The enactment of the Primary Education Act in 1985 has put too much pressure on Dutch teachers and resulted, in some cases, into a negative attitude towards innovation.

Principle 2: complex tasks; induce co-operation; commitment

According to all the participants the implementation of a complex innovation and the concomitant new tasks are in most cases not conducive to creative solutions. Thus co-operation among teachers is a necessity. The role of the principal is crucial: he/she can build a supportive climate which favours the co-operation. It is important that positive results are made visible for the staff and the environment.

The co-operation among teachers is supported by an ongoing discussion within the school which will lead to a shared understanding of the aims of the New Primary School. In other words: if the aims become clear and the teachers know exactly what the expectations are, commitment and involvement will increase.

But, all participants also recognised the difficulties when teachers are asked to co-operate. They underlined the importance of the external support system in establishing in the schools methods for collaboration.

Principle 3: education is more than content

It was generally accepted that this is an important principle. Since the school is a multi-dimensional system, attention must be paid to organisational issues as well as to the aims and the content of education. In other words: the main underlying assumption here is that not only the content of the curriculum is important, but also the supporting conditions which help teachers to put the content into practice.

This principle does not mean that there is not a need for a clear description of the aims and the content of the New Primary School. Some participants noticed that the evaluation report almost exclusively pays attention to the school organisation and the innovation process. They underlined that an ongoing discussion about the content remains necessary. For instance, to put into practice the general aims of an intercultural education, it is necessary to have ongoing discussions about the content. It is a normative discussion and it is essential that teachers have tools which enable them to be explicit about and to legitimate the content choices they want to make.

Principle 4: an intermediate level without power

There was a general agreement about the high quality of the Dutch support system.

During the discussions, many questions were raised about the meaning of "power". All groups came to the conclusion that one should make a distinction between power in terms of "control" and/or "evaluation" and power in terms of "expertise". Those who belong to the intermediate level should have the necessary abilities and skills! Specific training of all the change facilitators was considered essential. But the intermediate level should not have a mandate to control or to evaluate schools and teachers.

According to some groups the principal plays an important role in the collaboration with the intermediate level. He or she should take a pro-active stand and ask for specific support.

In almost every group, there were several questions about the collaboration between the local advisory centres, the inspectorate and the teachers training colleges which are also responsible for some inservice training activities. In general, the participants underlined the importance of clear agreements among all the bodies belonging to the intermediate level. An overlap of responsibilities and tasks between all these bodies should be avoided.

Principle 5: self-evaluation

It was generally accepted that in order to improve the local school and to implement an innovation effectively, critical and ongoing evaluation must be established at the level of the school.

Very interesting remarks were made in every group. Self-evaluation by teachers is important, but confrontation with the evaluation results gathered by an external body remains necessary. Self-evaluation also implies the capacity to justify the aims as well as the results. This is a very difficult operation for most teachers. And during the initial teacher training special attention must be paid to the evaluation process and to the exploration and use of available evaluation methods.

Some participants underline the idea that evaluation is an important part of the collaborative work among teachers. Good management by the principal of the evaluation process is essential!

Principle 6: planned change takes time

The innovation policy in the Netherlands, as far as the introduction of the New Primary School is concerned, incorporates this principle. On each level, in order to meet the innovative requirements of the Dutch Primary Education Act, participants have to adapt their roles and responsibilities. This kind of social change indeed takes time.

It is therefore also important to try to avoid factors which destabilise this long term process: a stable teaching group in a school and a supportive and creative principal are necessary.

4. General report presented during the symposium

In this general report a general evaluation of the innovation policy and the innovation process taking place in primary education in the Netherlands is presented. This general evaluation is based on the evaluation report, on the lectures presented during the symposium and on the group reports. This general report intends to be a framework which allows participants to understand the strong points of the Dutch policy; this framework also gives a background for the elaboration of some critical questions.

Four issues are explored in this report:

1. what are the important characteristics of the innovation project;

2. what does it mean when we conceptualise the implementation of a large-scale innovation project as an organisation development;

3. what are some important problems;

4. what is the link between the implementation of the New Primary School and the "professionalisation of the teaching staff".

4.1 The underlying paradigm (characteristics of the innovation project)

From the analysis of the New Primary School project in the Netherlands we have learned that:

1. education policy in general and innovation policy in particular take place at different levels (national, intermediate and local level);

2. this means that different organisations and parties are involved; they all look at the same event, "the innovation of primary education", from their own point of view, using different backgrounds and experiences. One may even make the assumption that the motives or reasons for participating can be different. In other words: it is a "multi-actor" event;

3. this also means that from the point of view of the national authorities, the main task seems to be to link the different levels and ongoing activities in such a way that the innovation process is moving in the right direction and that at the very end something fruitful will happen at the school and at the classroom level. A change in the teaching behaviours is still an important criterion when we look for effects of an innovation.

The problem of linkages between the different levels is an issue which is discussed in every working group. Questions about the specific roles and responsibilities of each level were discussed (see section 3 of this report).

The Dutch authorities are aware of the possibilities and also the limits of an innovation process going on at the same time at different levels. The Primary Education Act of 1985 clearly indicates a general paradigm - a way of thinking - for the management of primary education. In order to clarify this, one can quote briefly some of the main ideas described in chapter 1 of the Evaluation Report;

1. the Primary Education Act provides a framework for the development of primary education, while placing the responsibility for the specification at the school level;

2. as a consequence policy measures must always be directed at the local school. In other words: if the law is considered as a general framework and if it is up to the local school to develop and implement the general aims, all policy measures should give support and room to the local development. In other words: this

main philosophy of the law implies an evaluation criterion when it comes to elaborate more specific rules and procedures. And the ultimate criterion for the assessment of specific rules and procedures is the improvement of the quality of the local school. To make it more specific: rules related to extra money for the schools, extra staff provisions, rules related to the intermediate support system can be evaluated from the general rule that all these policy measures are good and acceptable as far as they support and improve the quality and the development of the local school;

3. there is a third issue of the general paradigm underlying the Primary Education Act which it is worthwhile to underline: "within the context of the general aims, variations at the local level are considered as acceptable". This is a logical consequence of the view that the act is nothing more than a general framework.

It is very important to observe that a national government, by using several means, makes it clear to the general public and to the educational system in particular that there exists a long-term strategy which will guide more specific policy activities in the coming decade.

Here we see that a national policy creates clear messages to the educational system and to the schools involved. This message is: the innovation will continue and remains important for the future.

One could call this process an Evolutionary planning model of policy-making. There are some generally accepted aims, there is a centrally organised stimulation plan, but there are not uniformly expected specific outcomes of the process. There is a continuous attention to the overall aims presented by the government, but local variations of these aims are accepted.

4.2 Implementation as organisation development (1)

Taking into consideration what has been said about the underlying paradigm and also going back to what Nijs Lagerweij and Dook Kopmels have presented, it is obvious that, as far as one can assess the Dutch situation, implementation of the New Primary School is considered as organisational development. A short exploration of the underlying assumptions of implementation as organisational development will clarify this statement:

1. organisations - such as schools - should function so as to satisfy the basic psychological and social needs of individuals, for autonomy and control over their own work, for participation in decisions affecting them, and for commitment to the purposes of the organisation (school);

2. organisations should be structured to maximise individual control, participation, and commitment at all levels; in other words: there is a clear distribution of responsibility for decisions and the daily activities among all levels of the organisation;

3. effective decision-making in organisations depends on the creation of effective working groups. Effective working groups are characterised by mutual agreement on goals, open communication among teachers, mutual trust and support among group members, full utilisation of members-skills and effective management of conflict;

4. the implementation process is necessarily one of consensus-building and accommodation between policy makers and implementers. The central problem of implementation is not whether implementers conform to prescribed policy but whether the implementation process results in consensus on goals, individual autonomy, and commitment to policy on the part of those who must carry it out;

5. project success depends primarily on the existence and mobilisation of local resources. The consequences which emerge from this analysis are that schools need a strong local training competent; that it is important to use local technical assistance; that the school should develop an independent relationship with the external support system, etc.

Many of these general ideas are confirmed by specific remarks in the group reports (see section 3 of this report): co-operation among teachers is a strong supporting factor; the principal (headteacher) plays a crucial role (a local resource); teamwork is a main condition for a good implementation process; teachers need tools in order to be able to discuss the goals and their teaching activities; self-evaluation, although it is difficult to implement, is an essential part of an effective teaching, etc.

These are interesting remarks and assumptions. It is important to pay attention to one consequence for those who are responsible for the policy and also for the policy-implementation. As a macro-model, organisation development forces us to recognise the extreme limits of one organisation's capacity to change the behaviour of another. When an agency at one level of policy attempts to implement policy through an agency at another level (see for instance the in-service-training activities organised by teacher training colleges, see also the supporting activities organised by the regional pedagogical centres), the implicit assumption is that the former controls factors that are important in determining the performance of the latter. But the OD-model suggests that those factors that have the greatest influence on the success or failure of implementation are precisely the ones over which external agencies have the least control. The maximum that one level of policy can do to affect the implementation process is to provide general support that enhances the internal capacity of organisations at another level to respond to the necessity for change.

In summary: if the analysis of the underlying paradigm is correct and if indeed the implementation is conceived of as organisation development, policy making becomes a rather frustrating activity. One may provide a general framework and general support, but one cannot control the activity at the school and at the classroom-level. One can provide extra money, but it is counterproductive to ask a school to provide information about the way the money is used. One can suggest as a general guideline to the schools to develop a school

work plan, but one cannot prescribe rules about the way in which the school work plan should be used. One can provide extra money for the integration of a remedial teacher in the regular teaching team, but one cannot ask a yearly report about the activities of the remedial teacher. In other words, a too detailed and prescriptive central management can easily be perceived by schools and teachers as evaluation and control. In this case the potential positive effects of a central stimulation plan disappear.

This illuminates the main problem (the core problem) for every country which has a longterm policy for the improvement of the quality of the educational system: how to find and to create an effective and supporting balance between general aims and procedures regarding the actual functioning of the school system on the one hand and the ongoing renewal at the local school level on the other hand? In other words: what does it mean for a national government and for the external support system to provide general support that enhances the internal capacity of the school?

4.3 Creating general support: what does this imply?

From the point of view of the government an effective link between the national decision level and the local level can be created through several policy measures. In most cases the introduction and implementation of policy measures also means that schools are confronted with some (new) requirements. In every country the government still has the responsibility for the innovation of the educational system. In other words: the government has the right to put forward some requirements vis-à-vis the schools and teachers.

In this context one critical remark, which is not only important for the Dutch situation, but for all countries represented in the symposium, should be considered. The further elaboration and specification of the basic principles of the law into more specific requirements and activities, could result in a situation which is no longer in line with the basic principles. Two examples:

1. according to section 11 of the Primary Education Act, every school should develop a school work plan which indicates what will be taught and how the teaching activities will be organised in order to meet the basic aims of the New Primary School. In other words, the national authorities try to be good managers; they have some goals in mind, they need a means to achieve these goals. And if they believe that the school work plan is the right means, they have the right to control the school work plan. The question is: are these types of requirements in line with the underlying assumptions of "the implementation as organisation development" or is this in contradiction with the basic principles?

2. in his presentation G van den Hoven discussed the problems related to the establishment of attainment standards for primary education. He also pointed out several advantages of having general standards formulated as clear as possible. But it could be that these standards will be translated into some very specific tests. These tests could be used to control the quality - in terms of students results - of every single

local school. Here again, we all know that it is very important for the government to be concerned about the quality of the education. The question is: will a specific policy measure, such as definition of attainment standards. more detailed descriptions of the content in relation to these standards, the use of specific tests, etc lead to the improvement of the quality of the educational system?

In more general terms, one of the recommendations to the Dutch authorities could be to be aware of the danger of an 'over-management' of the whole process which reduces the field of action for the local school and the local support system. Maybe there will always be a tension between "implementation as OD" and "implementation as system management" or even "implementation as a bureaucratic process".

Here we come to an interesting question: is it possible to suggest or to define one (or more) criterion (a) which can be used in this context as an evaluation tool by the national government?

4.4 Professionalisation as an evaluation criterion

Prof. Stevens in his lecture has underlined the importance of a good relationship between the teacher and pupils. Dook Kopmels also elaborated some ideas about co-operation and collaboration among teachers. These two kinds of relationships create opportunities for a continuous professionalisation of the teachers.

One can look at the same issue from a negative point of view. According to some group reports a number of teachers are demotivated and no longer interested in innovations. In that case, it is difficult to convince teachers to work after four o'clock at the school work plan.

I would like to recommend to those who are responsible for the national policy decisions that one important criterion for the evaluation of specific policy measures is the degree to which these measures will support and enhance professionalisation of teachers and of the supporting staff of the local pedagogical centre. This is a general suggestion, but taking into consideration the long-term goals of the Primary Education Act, it seems to be a good suggestion to use "continuous professionalisation of the teaching and supporting staff" as a main criterion. In other words, we are looking for schools where it is possible to develop a personally defined career.

It is possible to support teachers in such a way that they consider their career and define career satisfaction largely in subjective terms such as: I'm able to make a difference between pupils; I know how to work with parents; I know how to support a colleague; I know how to formulate questions during a workshop with people from the local support centre, etc.

There are at least two individually experienced factors which are critical to an individual's effectiveness, satisfaction and growth: level of opportunity and level of capacity.

1. Level of opportunity means the chance to develop basic competence; the presence of stimulation, challenge, and feedback about performance; and the support for efforts to try new things and acquire new skills.

Looking at the Dutch situation, given the general framework of the Primary Education Act, the well developed support structure, the organisation of all kinds of in-service activities, it seems that schools and teachers have indeed many opportunities to develop their career in an intellectually satisfactory way.

2. Level of capacity: capacity is the second aspect of a teaching position that shapes a teacher's sense of career and satisfaction. It is also called "power", because it is related to access to resources and the ability to mobilise them, but also the capability to influence the goals and direction of their institution (school).

It is quite clear from the evaluation report and the group's discussions that by introducing the school work plan as a means for the innovation of the primary school, teachers have the capability or at least the opportunity to influence the goals and direction of their school!

5. Notes

(1) See: R F ELMORE (1976). Organizational models of social programme implementation. In W Williams and R F Elmore, Social programme implementation. New York: Academic Press.

APPENDIX 1

PROGRAMME

Monday 24 October

As from 16.00:	Registration
18.00	Reception
19.00	Dinner
20.30	Opening by Mr Tiel de WIldE, Director General for Primary Education and Chairman of the Symposium: introduction of - aims of the symposium - working methods

Tuesday 25 October

9.30	Official address by Mrs N J GINJAAR-MAAS, Secretary of State, Ministry of Education and Science
10.00	Official address by Mrs Giulia PODESTÀ, Head of the School Education Division, Council of Europe
10.30	Break
11.00	Lecture by Drs G H van den HOVEN, General Manager of the Algemeen Pedagogisch Studiecentrum "The experiences in the Netherlands with the schoolwork plan"
11.45	Lecture by Prof. Dr. N A J LAGERWEY, University of Utrecht "Educational priority policy; experiences and evaluation results"
12.30	Lunch
14.00	Lecture by Prof. Dr. L M STEVENS, University of Utrecht "Mainstreaming for children with learning difficulties; experiences and new policy"
15.00	Break
15.30	Working session I (in working groups) (1)
17.30	

(1) Five groups: three English-speaking, one French-speaking, one bilingual.

18.30 Dinner

Evening Cultural event

Wednesday 26 October

9.00 Working session II (in working groups)

11.00 Break

11.15 Working session III (in working groups)

13.00 Lunch

Each working session will deal with the theme of each lecture. Each working group will appoint a chairperson and a rapporteur.

14.00 Poster session; short lectures; innovation materials

Drafting of the conclusions and recommendations by the rapporteur of the working groups and by the General Rapporteur, Prof. Dr. Roland VANDENBERGHE, University of Leuven (Belgium)

19.00 Dinner

20.00 Continuation of poster session and short lectures; communication with members of Project Group No. 8

Thursday 27 October

9.00 Presentation of conclusions and recommendations by the rapporteurs of the working groups

10.30 Break

11.00 Presentation of a report by Prof. Dr. R VANDENBERGHE, General Rapporteur

11.45 Plenary discussion

13.00 Lunch

14.00 Exchange of experiences of dissemination of Project No. 8's results in the member countries

19.00 Official dinner

Friday 28 October

School visits (Utrecht and Zeeland)

APPENDIX 2/ANNEXE 2

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS/LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS

BELGIUM/BELGIQUE: Mr H van ROMPUY, Inspector of Primary Education, Baron Carolylaan 14, B-2500 Lier

Mr René DELMELLE, General Inspector of Primary Education, Cité Administrative de l'état - 6th floor, Boulevard Pacheco, 19 bte 0, 1010 Brussels

CYPRUS/CHYPRE: Mr Nicos LEONTIOU, Inspector of Primary Education, Pedagogical Academy, Nicosia

DENMARK/DANEMARK: Mr Poul LASSEN, Educational Adviser, Ministry of Education, Frederiksholms Kanal 26, DK-1220 Copenhagen K

FINLAND/FINLANDE: Mr Jouko KÖNNÖLA, Counsellor Ministry of Education, pl 293, 00171 Helsinki

Mr Reijo LAUKKANEN, Chief Inspector, National Board of General Education, Hakanemenkatu 2, 00530 Helsinki

FRANCE: Mr Yves GUERIN, Representative of the under-board of reneval and adoption at schools in the School Board, Ministry of National Education, 110, rue de Grenelle, 75357-Paris Cedex

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY/REPUBLIQUE FEDERALE D'ALLEMAGNE: Dr. Paul DIESCH, Ministerialrat, Ministry of Culture and Sports Baden Württemberg, Postfach 480, D-7000 Stuttgart 1

GREECE/GRECE: Mr Georges MAVROIDIS, Pedagogical Adviser, 65, Leoforos Thiseeos, 14671 Nea Erithrea, GR-Athens

HOLY SEE/SAINT SIEGE: Prof. Don Guglielmo MALIZIA, Professor at the Faculty of Sciences and Education, Pontificia Universita, Salesiano, Piazza dell'Ateneo, Salesiano, n.1, 00139 Rome

ICELAND/ISLANDE: Mrs S JONSDOTTIR, Ministry of Education, Skipholt 37, 150 Reykjavik

IRELAND/IRLANDE: Mr Liam O'HEIGEARTA, Divisional Inspector, School Inspector's Office, Department of Education, Emmet Place, Cork

ITALY/ITALIE: Mr Corrado CANDIDI, Central Inspector, Public Ministry, Via M Falconi, 5, I-02046 Magliano Sabina (Rieti)

LIECHTENSTEIN: Dr. Rudolf BATLINER, Board of School Affairs, FL-9490 Vaduz

LUXEMBOURG: Prof. J-P OESTREICHER, General Inspector of Primary Education, 11c, Bd. Joseph II, L-1840 Luxembourg

Mr Fr HIERZIG, Instituteur-Attaché, Ministry of National Education and Youth, 6, Bd. Roual, L-2926 Luxembourg

MALTA/MALTE: Mr M C SULTANA, Dipartiment ta', 1-Edukazzjoni, Beltissebh

NETHERLANDS/PAYS-BAS: Dr H C M MULDER, Surinameplein 14, 1st floor, 1058 GP Amsterdam

NORWAY/NORVEGE: Mr Torleiv VAKSVIK, Director of Schools, Tinghuset, N-4600 Kristiansand

PORTUGAL: Mr Carlos VICENTE, Av 24 de Julho 140-72, 1390 Lisboa Codex

SAN MARINO/SAINT MARIN: Mrs Graziella DE SANTIS, Direttore Didattico della Scuola Elementare, Via Napoleone Bonaparte, 47031 Repubblica di San Marino

Mrs Grace MERLINI, Via del Bendio 6, Borgo, Repubblica di San Marino

SWEDEN/SUEDE: Mr Uno TUVESSON, Director of Fajansskolan, Radjursstugen 3, 311 00 Falkenberg

SWITZERLAND/SUISSE: Mrs Monica GATHER THURLER, 19 Rue des Areneys, CH-1806 St Légier

Mr Werner HELLER, Haldenbachstrasse, CH-8090 Zürich

TURKEY/TURQUIE: Mr Mustafa ERTÜRK, Turkish Ambassade, Jan van Nassaustraat 25, 2596 BM The Hague

UNITED KINGDOM/ROYAUME-UNI: Mr Don HOLLINGSWORTH, Department of Education and Science, Elizabeth House, 39 York Road, GB-London SE1 7PH

Prof. Maurice GALTON, School of Education, University of Leicester, 21 University Road, GB-Leicester LE 7RS

YUGOSLAVIA/YUGOSLAVIE: Mr Norbert JAUSOVEC, Professor in Psychology at the Faculty of Maribor, Kosancicev venac 29

LIST OF SPEAKERS, OBSERVERS AND RAPPORTEURS/LISTE DES ORATEURS, OBSERVATEURS ET RAPPORTEURS

Chairman of the/Président du Symposium:	Drs T W DE WILDE, General Director of Primary Education
General Rapporteur/Rapporteur Général	Prof. Dr. R VANDENBERGHE, Catholic University of Leuven (Belgium)
Speakers/Orateurs	Mrs Dr. N J GINJAAR-MAAS, Secretary of State, Ministry of Education and Science
	Mrs G PODESTÀ, Head of the School Education Division, Council of Europe
	Drs G H VAN DEN HOVEN, General Manager of the General Pedagogical Study Centre Amsterdam
	Prof. Dr. N A J LAGERWEIJ, Professor at the University of Utrecht
	Prof. Dr. L M STEVENS, Professor at the University of Utrecht
	Dr J KOPMELS, Foundation Regional Pedagogical Centre of Zeeland
Observers/Observateurs	Prof. Dr. A M P KNOERS President of the Council of Education Nassaulaan 6 2514 JS The Hague
	Council of Primary Education in the Netherlands Postbus 1004 3700 BA Zeist
	Mr S J STEEN Council of Private Schools in the Netherlands Bezuidenhoutseweg 225 2594 AL The Hague
	Mrs A JULI Council of Catholic Schools in the Netherlands Postbus 82158 2508 ED The Hague
	Mr C LANGSTRAAT Council of Protestant-Christian Education in the Netherlands Postbus 907 2207 AX Voorburg

Drs S RUTTEN
Centre of Promotion of Public Education
Cornelis de Wittlaan 119
2582 AA The Hague

Drs B M JANSSEN
Drs C E TRIEMSTRA
Ministry of Education and Science
Directorate General of Primary Education
Directory of Special Education

Mr J M M v d VEN
Ministry of Education and Science
Directorate General of Primary Education
Directory of Primary Education

Mr P A STOBBELAAR
Co-ordinating Inspector of Primary Education
Sleedoornlaan 7
5552 RA Valkenswaard

Mr A H N COSTER
Co-ordinating Inspector of Primary Education
De Weitjes 38
7722 LM Hoonhorst
Gem Dalfsen

Drs Th H J JUFFERMANS
Ministry of Education and Science
Directorate General of Educational Provision and Inspectorate
Directory of Educational Provision

Rapporteurs

Drs E M AKKER

Mrs Dr. C BROEYER

Mrs Dr. I A B van ERP

Mrs E C E de KLER

Mr J SWIERS

Substitute Rapporteurs/
Rapporteurs suppléants

Drs H BESSEMBINDERS

Drs C E TRIEMSTRA

Secretariat

Mrs J FRENSCH-GOBERT

Mrs J WARDENIER

Mrs W TOETENEL

Mr J van DRUNEN (Congress Department)

Secretariat Council of Europe/Secretariat du Conseil de l'Europe	Mrs Y DONAZZOLO assistant/assistante
	Mr Jacques VANDELOOK translator/traducteur
Interpreters/Interprètes	Mr Patrick BOSMAN-BELZONS
	Mr David CRAINE
	Mrs Danielle BOLHUIS-ZERNER
	Mrs Aimee VIJVERBERG

APPENDIX 3

REPORTS OF THE WORKING GROUPS

Group I

Session I

Chairman: Mr Werner HELLER
Rapporteur: Mrs Dr. Conny BROEYER

Principle I - Level of responsibility/level of abstraction

Most of the group felt that decentralisation of responsibility promoted educational innovation (in a highly centralised system it was difficult to introduce change). But it was necessary to proceed gradually and avoid drastic change. Giving responsibility did not mean problems ceased to exist.

Principle II - Complex tasks are a stimulus to co-operation

- But they generated frustrations, did not necessarily produce a creative approach and
- produced teacher loss of confidence

Encouragement of co-operation was necessary but working conditions (eg staff continuity) were the main factor.

The Netherlands support centres were an excellent institution.

Principle I

With regard to levels of responsibility, the Netherlands was going too fast and too far. There was no point in rushing things. Was it really teachers' job to draw up the entire school plan? Most of the group felt it was fine to involve teachers in preliminary discussion and take account of their criticisms but that to have them design the whole scheme was going too far.

In theory it seemed ideal but teachers were no better equipped to do it than in other countries.

Principle II - Complex tasks

Just how much latitude was being given?/ What was the extent of the autonomy?

The time allowed for making the changes and achieving the aims was too short.

Did teachers in the Netherlands know how to draw up a full school plan? In some places the arrangement was not working well.

Principles I and II

France:
- The system was highly centralised: national aims, application at local level;
- teachers did not yet know how to self-evaluate;
- making innovations was therefore difficult. An attempt was being made to decentralise.

Belgium: - Some administrative and financial autonomy had just been introduced;

- but the curriculum was centrally planned (VLO project)(1);

- the main thing was to have a team that stayed the same over a number of years.

Switzerland: - Within each canton a highly centralised system with only two levels: central and classroom.

Thus no innovating agent.

Portugal: - A certain amount of autonomy was gradually being introduced;

- regional administration.

Principle III

Session II

Education is more than content.

There was unanimity on this principle.

The report focused on school life and the innovation process. In future more attention could be paid to syllabus and learning.

Principle IV - an intermediate level without power

The intermediate level had two functions, one advisory, the other supervisory.

The idea of a centre to provide necessary expertise but which did not have any supervisory powers was attractive to most of the group.

It was possibly more important, however, to have innovation agents in the schools. Care must also be taken that relations between the inspectorate and the support services stayed on the right track: there was a danger of bureaucratisation in that teachers might start asking for ready recipes. In centrally-generated innovation supervisory services could be very important in interpreting the law. It was necessary to avoid conflict between the inspectorate's approach and the support services' approach.

France: - The inspectorate had a dual function: there was no problem of resistance to change.

---

(1) VLO: Vernieuwd Lager Onderwijs. The VLO project's innovative approach is similar to that advocated by the CDCC's Project No. 8

Switzerland: - The inspectorate also had a dual function but was highly resistant to change.

Belgium: - The inspectorate performed two functions except in some projects.

Portugal: - Schools were not prepared to accept help from the centres, which were also ignored by the inspectorate.

Session III

Principle V - Self-evaluation: the guardian angel of educational improvement

Fine in principle, but results of self-evaluation needed comparing with those of external evaluation.

In addition, teachers needed training in self-evaluation. Such training must not be confined to formulation of general principles.

A detailed self-evaluation method was a good idea but very difficult to design.

Self-evaluation could help diagnose the reasons for failures.

Who gave schools the tools and resources? The intervention strategy was the trickiest part.

- Was the purpose of self-evaluation clear?

- Training had a very important part to play.

In France there was an evident need for evaluation training. Everyone talked about differentiated teaching but putting it into practice was difficult. Evaluation in schools generated facts but less often analysis or alterations. The inspectorate needed to develop its training role in this field.

Principle VI - Planned change takes time

1. Very important: this was a long, slow and frustrating process.

2. In the Netherlands this was realised.

In 20 years' time the changes would have been made, but society would have changed ...

A balance needed striking between injecting impetus and giving people time.

GROUP II

Chairman: Prof. Jean-Pierre OESTREICHER
Rapporteur: Mrs Evelien de KLER

Principle I - Level of responsibility/level of abstraction

I. Two innovation strategies:

a. from the top down;

b. from the bottom up.

The Netherlands tried to combine the two approaches.

Difficulties encountered:

- the first approach required a high degree both of flexibility and discipline on teachers' part;

- the second was rather Utopian. Both required, on the ground, a body of teachers with uncommon qualities so that the "rank and file" could keep up with the pacesetters at the top.

II. Experience in other countries showed that innovation which left the teacher a lot of initiative was liable to be carried through by only a small proportion of teachers. From "launch" it took a long time to start producing results. There had to be the right balance of local autonomy and centrally-imposed policy.

III. Policy had to be unambiguous in all sectors, particularly in the various school support services which liaised between the centre and the periphery.

The question therefore needed asking whether the educational model was the same everywhere.

IV. In innovation planning it was essential to have constant dialogue between "top" and "bottom" so that the final legislation took account of the experience of the rank and file.

V. The requirement on every school to draw up a full plan was one of the Act's main innovations. The question was whether the government had given sufficient guidance about the various disciplines, organisation, syllabus content and minimum learning objectives, all of which the plan had to cover.

Equally, if aims were spelt out in too much detail, it was liable to confine schools' freedom to syllabus and methods.

VI. A long-term process of change involving constant adjustments so as to reconcile expectations at the top with those of the people on the ground needed adequate resources and time.

In the Netherlands, like everywhere else, the innovation aims were ambitious but the resources made available inadequate:

- class sizes were growing;

- not enough time was set aside for teacher discussion or consulting the various partners in the educational community (including parents).

VII. It was important to establish various networks - eg:

- a network of teachers within the one school;

- a network of teachers in different schools;

- a network comprising the various actors in the education system,

if the exercise was to be properly participative and if chaos was to be avoided.

VIII. Innovation such as was being carried through in the Netherlands could not work unless there was staff continuity. But were resources adequate to guarantee continuity?

Principle II - Complex tasks are a stimulus to co-operation

Teachers' responsibilities and function needed clearly defining, as did the basic training requirements.

Did everyone understand what the required full school plan involved (function, criteria, etc)?

Another point was that there was some inconsistency between allowing freedom at local level on the one hand and a tendency to overstructure on the other.

A possible solution was to have clearly defined educational aims of a consensual kind.

The school head had an extremely important role to play in a co-operation-oriented school.

Principle III - Education is more than content

The group broadly agreed with this but some were afraid that treating the school as an organisation might lead to neglect of children's needs, basic values and the European dimension.

While reorganising internally, school needed to give proper attention to relations with parents and agree the educational priorities with them (school as a child-care facility or an educational agency, parents' role, ways in which parents could help their children, etc.).

Teachers must first learn to co-operate among themselves, then with parents.

Co-operation in school provided the basis (the skills and self-confidence) to establish constructive contact with the community at large.

The next stage would be for school and parents to collaborate locally in educational action to solve the problems caused by socio-economic trends.

Principle IV - An intermediate level without power

Two observations:

- absence of power in the sense of authority/supervisory power was a key factor. As soon as an adviser had an evaluation role, it interfered with his advisory function;

- outsiders were never accepted in schools and advisers must have sound inside knowledge.

The value of support services was unquestionable, but there was a risk of their giving in to schools' resistance to change.

Questions: how to induce schools to change without alienating them? How to keep an eye on the innovation action of the support services?

The head of the school was important here: he provided the liaison between the staff and the support services.

At all events care must be taken not to cramp the action of the support services by not giving them enough money.

Was there a danger of the support services becoming a third power?

Principle V - Self-evaluation

Everyone agreed there had to be self-evaluation. The question was how to train teachers to carry it out.

It was necessary to:

- avoid making the teacher feel needlessly guilty;

- adopt a highly practical approach and use as criteria very precise aims relating directly to needs on the ground.

Important conclusion: the full school plan should set out self-evaluation criteria.

The problem was twofold:

1. self-evaluation had not yet become a routine procedure;

2. to be able to evaluate their performance teachers needed an explicit pedagogical model (how the pupil learned, how the teachers functioned as a group).

The group stressed that here too there had to be changes in attitude which would be difficult to achieve:

- it had to be possible to diagnose error (five-zone model);
- practical problems needed airing;
- there had to be an effective remedial strategy;
- support was necessary from the teachers;
- more work was needed on the problem of misattribution (Stevens);
- it was necessary to decide who was responsible for what.

Principle VI - Planned change takes time

There had to be an awareness that the new aims (to provide for the child's specific needs and ensure continuity of such provision) and the reorganisation they implied could not be achieved without conflict and discomfiture (power conflict between pre-school and primary school, disagreements about the educational model) the various partners. Not until such conflict had been resolved would the partners really be able to get down to work. If unresolved, such conflict was liable to prevent tangible results. And if the emphasis from the outset was not on practical problems, the project would seem divorced from everyday realities and the school's impetus would burn itself out.

The needs were:

- a stable teaching group;
- to lay down achievable intermediate aims;
- a head of school who motivated and was supportive;
- input (adequate resources, acknowledgement of teachers' efforts etc);
- monitoring; competent support.

GROUP III

Presentator: Mr Don HOLLINGSWORTH
Rapporteur: Drs Elja AKKER

I. There is some doubt about this being a principle.

Clarification by D Kopmels: it is about the position of the teachers in the existing system. Statement: it is important that all levels appreciate their own role and the role(s) and responsibilities of others. Everybody agrees.

II. General agreement in the group about the question "WHAT-to teach":

1+2 Should be the responsibility of society: central, local or schoolboard;

The "WHAT-to teach" question: hov far should you go in specifying the curriculum:

General agreement about not to specify anymore than necessary to ensure the essentials within the broad curriculum;

The "HOW-to teach" question should be a matter of the teacher(s).

Freedom in the "HOW-to teach" requires the need for co-operation between the teachers as a team.

The "HOW-to teach" question: hov can we stimulate teachers to co-operate? - the importance of the climate; the role of management.

3. Sweden: we still have "teachers" in our schools, who insist on their autonomy.

In Denmark: two or three teachers handle per group all the subject matters.

Turkey: we still have a centralised system: in the future we will have more team co-operation.

III. Education is more than content; all members of the working party agreed on this principle.

2a. Concerning the existing situation in the Netherlands there are separated schools for special education. The discussion-group formulated the following:

In order to provide an education which is more than simply cognitive based education, each school population should be a mirror of real society; each school should give children the full experience of society and therefore you should keep all categories of pupils as much as possible together.

Putting children in separate special schools is an impoverishment for these children but also for the groups from which they are taken. One implication of this principle is ensuring that normal schools have the financial and other resources necessary to meet the needs of all categories of pupils.

Another implication is that schools or teachers should specify and make clear to parents that they want to offer to the pupils, besides the content, the possibility of experiences with groups with the full range of abilities.

2b. The evaluation of the two Dutch policy measures makes it clear that the implementation programmes do take this principle into account. However the reading courses did not; they were pure content orientated. In these particular courses there has been a certain neglect of the implementation processes that should take place in the schools themselves.

IV. An intermediate level without power

2a. Teacher-training is often too academic; operating as on an island.

2b. There is an overlap of responsibilities between teacher-training colleges and local advisory services.

2c. Secondary education is not supported by local advisory services. So there is an institutional discontinuity.

2d. Amazement about the very large numbers of support-institutions on the national level.

Recommendations

The need for greater cohesion of support services in the geographical region and also in other countries:

- it is important in the Dutch situation to have an intermediate level without power;

- it is important to have a co-operation between the teacher training college and the local advisory service.

V. Agreement that in order that the system can improve and innovation become effective, critical evaluation must be established at the level of the school.

VI. Agreement that planned change takes time. Once innovation concepts as planning and evaluation are incorporated in the law, not only teachers have to change, but also the members of the support structure and the local and national authorities. On each level, participants have, in order to meet the innovative requirements of the new Dutch Primary Education Act, to adapt their roles and responsibilities. This kind of social change is a long term process.

Working sessions Group IV

Chairman: Prof. M GALTON
Rapporteur: Mrs Dr. I A B VAN ERP

1. General remarks

- Agreement on applicability of the six principles in the countries.

- The principles are highly related: during the discussion several principles were at the same time relevant.

- The general feeling was that principle II (commitment/co-operation) in combination with V (self-evaluation) formed the core. With these two principles the others can be tackled (for example: the gap between the more general decisions and teaching reality can be made less wide through co-operation and self-evaluation).

2. Specific remarks towards six principles

I. Level of responsibility

2. Positive elements in the Dutch system are the temporal financial rewards of schools who are trying to implement - parts of - the central decision as described in the law (for example: failure of implementation and the existence of external contribution result in blaming the project for a lack of results; with rewards you take away this attribution-possibility.

3a. Most countries try to create or have established intermediate systems to facilitate translation of general decisions. These systems are not always helpful (for example: teachers carry on using the textbook as reference for their teaching and not the curriculum).

3b. There is a tendency to go from centralised - specific - decisions to a more decentralised discussion with a wider responsibility for schools/municipalities to put the general guidelines into practice.

II. Complex tasks/induce co-operation/commitment

1. In the process of trying to establish commitment the role of the headteacher is essential. Also the process of understanding plays an important role in getting teachers - and schools - to co-operate. This also applies for the first principal.

3a. In most countries it is recognised that it is hard (difficult) to get schools to co-operate (breaking through the isolated position).

3b. In this process, the teacher has to have the feeling that he is leading his own change (innovation). Therefore support and (external) guidance must not come too soon.

- Some members feared a possible negative side-effect of establishing co-operation; when it is established, there is the danger of further isolation between the innovative school(s) and centralised decisions resistance to "outside" occurrences/demands (for example: the centralised decision for attainment-targets).

III. Education is more than content

1a. To put into practice the general aims of, for example, multi-cultural education must result in discussions about the content in practice. It is a normative discussion and it is essential that teachers have tools to be explicit about the choices (for example discussion with fellow teachers about the daily practice, the positive and negative aspects of what is observed.).

1b. It is a problem for teachers to integrate these "national values" into practice. Therefore it is important to "force" the teachers to discuss these matters, so that they will feel responsible/capable to implement it in the educational content.

2. It is difficult to measure "activity" on this principle. In the bottom-up strategy, the consequences are interpreted in a variety of ways in schools.

3. In some countries the priority lies on the content, because this principle cannot be planned ("we do not know how to"). In some it is thought of as the responsibility of the schools.

IV. Intermediate level

1. One must be aware of the danger that the intermediate level only reaches schools who - in fact - do not need the guidance, so that schools who need the guidance are not reached.

2. The influence from intermediate agencies to schools seems to be adequate, but this working party found no solutions to improve the relation between the intermediate level and the level of policy-making.

3a. The process of innovation is influenced by an intermediate level. (In all countries there is an intermediate level.)

3b. Guidance plays an important role in innovation. Therefore specific training of people who perform the guidance is essential (for example: to prevent discommunication between supporter and teacher).

V. Self-evaluation

1a. It is agreed that self-evaluation is an essential principle, but also that it is very difficult to implement it. It is a form of implementing responsibility: to justify the given responsibility by self-evaluation.

1b. It is stressed that teachers should not only evaluate themselves in isolation; co-operation with colleagues (share the same problems and solutions).

2a. It seems difficult to transfer the results of evaluation into practice (for example because of the task uncertainty of teachers and judgments).

2b. It is a long process of collecting evidence of the way the teacher performs (one could, for example, use the ideas of pupils about the teacher).

2c. Be aware of the "counterflow"-effect of using self-evaluation, in combination with attainment target and choosing schools by parents.

2d. Discussion about the use of self-evaluation as means for the schoolteam or as a political instrument to improve education and teacher performance.

VI. Planned change takes time

1. There is a paradox - as schools co-operate they tend to abstract problems and to express these in general terms - hence the gap between policy makers and schools should gradually reduce overtime. Hence school sharing approaches are a very important way of bridging gaps in understanding between policy makers and schools.

3. Schools should be aware of the gap between general aims and their practice; many are doing more to cope with the problems at general level.

Working session 1 Group V

Chairman: Mr Michael SULTANA
Rapporteur: Mr Jos SWIERS

I. The principle of responsibility/abstraction

1. It was felt that the principle in itself is not so conducive. To encourage greater openness and commitment by teachers the gap between the levels must be bridged. This makes the communication between the levels less difficult. And if the gap is not bridged, teachers will have the feeling that they cannot fulfill what has been decided at a higher level. Otherwise it takes time to "translate" from one level to the other. The group felt that it is important for/that:

- teachers to get the chance and time to elaborate the abstract ideas and make it work in practice

- the elaboration has to be done by experienced teachers, open to innovation

- teachers need instruments to facilitate their work: for example a modelplan curriculum

2. The evaluation report shows that teachers have become more and more demotivated. One of the main reasons is the pressure as a result of too high expectations.

The enactment of the Primary Education Act in 1985 has put too much pressure on Dutch teachers and resulted in a negative attitude against innovation.

The necessary transition period (1973-1985) has not apparently been long enough.

3. In most countries there have been bad experiences with a centralised curriculum, because teachers are not able to translate it in the right way and as a result the central curriculum is an instrument for control. A model curriculum, supported by basic textbooks, is a better solution.

Experiences in some countries say it takes a long time to realise the aims and goals of innovation after the introduction of a new curriculum or a new act.

4. The headteacher is an important feature in innovation. The elaboration of a school work plan has to be made by the schoolteam. The headteacher has to realise the integration of new teachers and experienced teachers in a unit for innovation.

II. The principle of complex tasks induce co-operation

1. To execute complex tasks, the teacher has to believe in what has to be done. This will induce greater commitment and stimulate co-operation. To reach this goal teachers need time and support. In order to favourise this goal teachers should open their doors to colleagues and co-operate on educational activities.

2. The group has the impression that in Dutch primary education the co-operation between teachers will decrease because teachers have become demotivated.

3. If the aims are clear and if the teachers know exactly what is expected of them, commitment and involvement will increase.

III. The principle: education is more than content

1. It was the general opinion that a school is a multi-dimensional organism. The content of education and changes in other "zones" is not only the responsibility of one teacher, but have to be a staff policy. One of the main points of this policy presupposes that it is not only the content of education which is important, but also the way it is put into practice towards children. Teachers are the essential factor in the implementation. This principle will be attained if the following conditions are accomplished:

- good management
- teamwork
- a good support system that co-operates with the teacher training centre.

2. Although there has been a drive towards the implementation of innovation, the level of expectations was not up to the required standard. Reading the evaluation report it becomes clear that teachers were not ready for the Primary Education Act. There is a high degree of adoption, but implementation has only just started. Initial and in-service training should prepare teachers better and induce them to greater involvement. There has not been enough co-operation between the school support services and the teacher training colleges. And again: innovation is too complex and cannot be realised in too short a time.

A way of surmounting this problem is to give teachers more time and facilities. One of the questions raised in the group was why not, for the changes in other zones, adopt the same measures that have been used for the implementation of the new subject area English language.

3. Past experience has shown that due attention should be given to the preparation of teachers when implementing new projects.

Since teachers are workers and not philosophers, extra attention and help should be provided to such attitudes and skills, so that they can do their job properly.

IV. The principle: an intermediate level without power

1. The group felt that it is important to have respect for the professionalism at the different levels and to appeal for the help of professional people.

So it is a very important task for support services to do the analysis of problems at school level.

2. Further clarification was requested by the group about the Dutch school support system, which acts as the liaison between the national authorities and the school.

In spite of the opinion of the group that in the Netherlands there is a good support system, it was felt that there is not enough co-operation between primary schools and teacher training colleges and that there is such a large number of special schools.

V. The principle: self-evaluation

1. Self-evaluation has to be seen as a complex task as has been formulated in principle II. So it can be expected that schools will have a lot of difficulties to put self-evaluation into practice, because there are different levels of evaluation. It is better to speak of self-evaluation as a guardian angel instead of the guardian angel of school improvement. Self-evaluation is linked to good management and teachers can better shoulder their responsibilities if they are well informed. Therefore it is important that the teachers feel themselves safe to carry out the tasks assigned to them.

Distinction has to be made between the various levels of self-evaluation, namely:

- internal evaluation
- external evaluation
- group evaluation
- individual evaluation.

Conditions for self-evaluation are:

- teamwork training
- in-service training
- the right support service.

2. The group was not impressed by the measures in the evaluation report regarding self-evaluation. The group also considered the wastage of the experience of female teachers of the former nursery schools. It was suggested that measures would have to be taken to rectify this problem.

3. It was also felt that teachers should learn in a special way how to evaluate and that teachers themselves are subject to evaluation. All the levels have to realise what they are asking from the teaching staff.

VI. Planned change takes time

This principle was tackled in conjunction with other principles mentioned earlier on and in particular with principle II wherein was stated that teachers need time to work out policies. They also need a good preparation, motivation and adequate supportive aid.

Then commitment will grow and devotion to the implementation job will contribute to the realisation of the new primary school.

APPENDIX 4

EXCHANGE OF VIEWS AND INFORMATION IN PARTICULAR ON DISSEMINATION AT NATIONAL LEVEL OF THE RESULTS OF CDCC's PROJECT NO. 8 ON "INNOVATION IN PRIMARY EDUCATION"

WRITTEN REPORTS HANDED IN AT THE SYMPOSIUM

BELGIUM (Flemish-speaking)

Dissemination of the results of Project No. 8, "Innovation in primary education".

1. Brussels colloquy, 17 and 18 June 1988.

Report by G. Baert, honorary inspector, "The VLO project observed: developments and prospects".

Address by the Minister for Education, "Overhaul of primary education: interconnections and prospects".

2. Information circulated by project group members in the inspectorate: copies of the final report of Project No. 8, "Innovation in primary education".

Opinion on extending Project No. 8; development proposals.

3. Circulars and booklets giving progress reports on the VLO project. Periodic assessments.

CYPRUS

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION
DISTRICT EDUCATION OFFICE NICOSIA

KORNESIOS SCHOOL, NICOSIA (THE CONTACT SCHOOL PLAN)

REPORT ON THE DISSEMINATION - ACTIVITIES
OF KORNESIOS PROJECT

1. Topic of innovation

Active participation of pupils in the organisation of the school community and the interdisciplinary teaching - learning approach in the school.

2. Objectives of the project

- Higher interest and productivity on behalf of pupils through full use of their capabilities, needs, experiences and interests.

- Reinforcement of the co-operation between children, teachers and parents.

- Improvement of pupils' sociability, enrichment of initiative strengthening of responsibility and their role in a well functioning democratic society.

- Improvement of personnel's effectiveness in teaching, co-operation and organisational climate.

- Active involvement of parents and the community in different aspects of school life.

3. Dissemination of activities

A great number of activities have been organised at all phases of the practice and are still to be suggested to educators all over the island. This short report will just mention briefly some of these activities which are carried out by those involved in the project:

a. The principal of the school (A Damianos) in his role as a lecturer at the Pedagogical Institute which organises in-service training courses for teachers.

b. The head of the Department of Primary Education (A Papadopoulos) who promotes a project for inspectors of school and other personnel (multipliers).

c. The Inspector of Kornesios Primary School (N Leontíou) who plans programmes for other schools, teachers and the Pedagogical Academy of Cyprus for student teachers.

Activities

1. Acquaintance of the school's personnel (inspectors, principal, teachers) pupils and parents with the philosophy and content of the project, through seminars, discussions, planning and practical applications.

2. Final trial of the project at the school, and formative evaluation by teachers and the principal.

3. Attendance in class by parents.

4. Publication of Kornesios project together with all other eleven projects in a 65-page book, distributed to all 450 schools in the country, a number of schools in Greece and interested educators.

5. Organised visits of all students of the Pedagogical Academy at the school and close study of activities relevant to the project. This means that in a few years this innovative project will expand and spread in most of the schools in the country.

6. Publication of the project in local newspapers and educational magazines. All local newspapers have presented in articles and photographs several activities of the project.

7. The project has been presented in television programmes.

8. Video cassettes covering the project have been produced and are used in service courses for teachers by the Pedagogical Institute of Cyprus.

9. Presentation of the project by A Papadopoulos at the regular inspectors' meetings where it was discussed and criticised.

10. Promotion of several phases of the project, especially the part of the pupil, involvement in decision-making within the school.

11. A new publication of Kornesios covering a summary and a report of the local project as well as all projects of the Contact School Plan. This book will be distributed to schools and among teachers so that European innovations will be widely known.

12. Kornesios will always be open for other schools and teachers to arrange visits and discussions on the project.

13. Inspectors of schools will present the new ideas of Europe during regional meetings and seminars with teachers.

14. Organisation by A Papadopoulos of a national seminar in Nicosia, in March 1988 - the first of the series of national seminars in CDCC's member states - for the presentation and discussion of the findings of CDCC's Project No. 8 on "Innovation in primary education".

15. Publication of the lectures delivered by A Papadopoulos at the Delphi National Seminar in the magazine "The family and the school" which reaches every community in Cyprus and is distributed every two months five times a year.

The whole project will be under constant evaluation by the school's personnel and the inspectors who will be free at any time to visit the school and discuss any activities.

Nicos Leontiou
Inspector of Schools
Liaison with the Pedagogical Academy

Nicosia 19.10.1988

DENMARK

Dissemination of Project No. 8

1. Translation of the Final Report

Chapters 1, 2, 3 and 4 will be translated into the Nordic languages (Swedish, Norwegian and Danish) and distributed to educational authorities, advisers, teacher-trainers, etc in the three countries.

The funds for the translation is given by the Nordic Council of Ministers.

2. Seminar on Project No. 8

In a series of seminars for educational advisers in the Ministry of Education (March 1989), there will be one day devoted to Project No. 8.

Prof. Maurice Galton from the United Kingdom will be the lecturer.

3. The translated part of the Final Report will be sent to all members of the newly appointed "Council for Innovation". The Council has been set up by the Minister of Education in order to direct a large-scale innovation project 1988-91. The annual cost will be 8 million K, a total of 32 million K for four years.

4. An article about the project has been written (not yet published) to the official magazine by the Ministry of Education.

Poul Lassen

FINLAND
MINISTRY OF EDUCATION October 1988

FINLAND

Application of the CDCC Project No. 8 Innovation in Primary Education in Finland

The points taken up in the Final Report of Project No. 8 Innovation in Primary Education have relevance and give support to the objectives set for the development of primary education in Finland. This is why it has been considered worthwhile in Finland to take active measures to disseminate information about the project and to encourage discussion on the content of the Final Report.

The first phase

The Ministry of Education and the National Board of General Education arranged a national follow-up seminar on the project Innovation in Primary Education in Heinola on 11-15 April 1988. The purpose of the seminar was to acquaint teachers with the results of the project and to analyse the content of the Final Report in detail. The participants also discussed the solutions applied by various European countries to primary education, as regards both administration and pedagogics. On the basis of the draft Final Report and other relevant documents. the seminar tried to find an answer to the question: how can primary education be further developed in Finland?

The first two days of the seminar took an international perspective to the issues. Mr Maitland Stopart of the CDCC and Dr. Dook Kopmels from the Netherlands took part in the seminar on these two days. The rest of the seminar was devoted to national issues.

The seminar was attended by representatives of all the Finnish institutes of teacher training and the practice schools attached to them, and provincial school authorities, who arrange teachers' in-service training. The central organisations of municipalities and the teachers' trade union were also represented. The daily press showed keen interest in the proceedings of the seminar.

Second phase

The Final Report of the project will be distributed to the seminar participants and to all who do research on primary instruction.

Third phase

The Final Report will be partially translated into Finnish. The text will be edited, and relevant Finnish examples will be added. A national commentary will also be included; this will be based on the discussions carried out at the national follow-up seminar. The Finnish version of the Final Report should come out in autumn 1989. The report is intended to encourage national debate on primary education.

Fourth phase

In 1990 another national follow-up seminar on Innovation in Primary Education will be held to find out how the Final Report and its Finnish version have been applied to teacher training and primary instruction in Finland.

FRANCE

INNOVATION IN PRIMARY EDUCATION

1. Ministerial priorities and innovation

- schools must act against all forms of inequality;
- schools are places of diversity;
- schools are places for promoting children's personal development;
- lastly, schools are meeting places for such partners as parents, local authorities and voluntary associations, under the supervision of educational staff.

2. Working guidelines and setting up of innovation

- enhancing the effectiveness of primary schools by combating all aspects of educational under-achievement (improving facilities for taking in children from the age of two and three, particularly in priority educational areas); giving every child his fair chance by intensifying help for pupils in difficulty and remedial assistance for those who have temporarily fallen behind;
- taking into account the various rates of assimilation and consolidating a differentiated educational approach;
- developing art education and cultural action; using the new technologies (a drive to provide training for primary school teachers towards improved use of computer facilities).

3. Two instruments of innovation: priority educational areas and the Innovation Subsidy Fund

- specific resources (overtime allocations and operational appropriations) were identified at the beginning of the 1988/89 school year for funding new, diversified measures;

  these resources are being distributed subsequently to examination of projects under the guidelines issued by the "Académies" and departmental policies for promoting academic success;

- such projects may be elaborated for one school, a group of schools, or even an educational district. They must comprise accurate analysis of needs, strict definition of aims, identification of the various partners involved, description of the educational strategies adopted, and details of available or requisite resources and the practical arrangements for internal and external evaluation.

4. Dissemination of innovation: an innovation data bank is to be set up to be accessed via telematics (EDUTEL).

5. In order to enrich current deliberations and actions, the conclusions of Project Group No. 8, which tie up with many of the adopted guidelines, are being disseminated to the Recteurs and the Inspecteurs d'Académie.

Mr Yves Guerin
Inspecteur d'Académie
(Inspector of Schools)
Head of the Sub-Directorate on
School Innovation and Adaptation

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

The special educational and training task of the primary school

1. Tasks and aims

Primary school is the basic place of our school system where all children are together.

The special task of primary schools is marked as follows:

- promoting the various and different talents and gifts of the children during four years where all children are together;
- awakening and bringing out of all the ethical, religious, social and democratical facts on which all life is based;
- acquisition of secured knowledge and the practising abilities which are important for life and basical for school work.

2. Principles of the work in primary schools

All educational and training processes join the experienced world of the child and enlargen this world.

3. Characteristics of teaching in primary schools

a. Love for the local environment and open-mindedness for the world;.

b. Playing and learning.

c. Differentiated teaching.

d. Building-up of scholar-learning during the first time in school.

e. School as a place to live in.

f. Training/repetition - homework.

4. Tasks of the teachers

He or she is the friend and partner of the children confided in him/her. Whenever several teachers teach in the same class they work together according to the principles of the all-comprising teaching method.

5. Co-operation with parents and educational institutions

In favour of the child primary school has to try to co-ordinate, together with the parents, the style of education in school and home and fill this relation with life.

Development of the curriculum

1. All teachers meet

- before starting the school year

- before starting the second half of the school year

and develop in co-operation the curriculum for the respective classes or grades.

Their work is based on

- the curriculum for primary schools

- the entity of all medias (books, slides etc)

- curricula of former years.

The set-up of the curricula is for each subject and includes tips for subject-connecting aspects.

2. First distribution of the themes for all of the scholastic year/the scholastic month/the scholastic week. Starting point for all of the sections are special frame themes.

3. Detailed distribution of the themes

The detailed distribution is set up by harmonising the frame themes with the school books.

Weekly plans for each subject are set up.

Special aspects

The all-comprising teaching method in primary schools demands an inter-relation of the subjects wherever this seems to be convenient.

Special courses (for instance mathematics, writing) are planned additionally.

In grades 3 and 4 you start with special subject-teaching. The contents of the subject are worked out as follows:

- adaptability to the age of the child;

- relation to the place where the school is situated.

The curriculums are set up for 30 weeks when you have 36 scholastic weeks. Thereby you get a free time of six weeks which is meant to be used for teaching new interesting themes.

The teachers note their teaching experiences concerning the order of the themes and the necessary times used for the themes into the plans.

Grade	Teacher	Year	Fourth Week
Klasse 10/16	Lehrerin Bu / Sta	Schuljahr 1988/89	4. Woche 12.9.-17.9.88

	Subjects Themen	Tips – Media/Lit Hinweise – Medien/Lit
Sprechen	Ich lerne es immer besser, mich zu Wort zu melden I'm going better at waiting to my turn (social behav Everybody knows that.	
Lesen-lernen Learning how to read	Alle suchen - new full words : searching sun - neue Ganzw. : suchen Sonne - Ausglied. : s, S - selection pl. s, S	Poster (3) Poster Fi: S. 8/9 First Gra Book AB. S. 5-8 Practising Book
Schreiben Writing	- Schreibübung zu o Exercises to practise the letter o	ABs Practising Sheets
Heimat- u. Sachunt. Local Science	Unit 7 Behaviour in Traffic Section 1: Verhalten i. Verkehr Th: Beim Überqueren d. Fahrbahn ist bes. Vorsicht erforderlich - Crossing at a traffic-light - Überqueren an d. Ampel - Überqueren am Überweg - Crossing at the zebra-crossing	Book page 52/53 Sachb. S. 52/53
Bildende Kunst Art	Lesson 1 AB 1: Graphik / Reißtechnik Gegenseitige Beziehungen zueinander darstellen Co-theme Gemeinschaftsarbeit: Th.: Bunte Fische i. Aquarium	- Buntpapier - Klebstoff - past - blaues Tonpapier als Hintergrund Blue paper as a background
Musik Music	Lied: Bruder Jakob: "Frère Jacques" Song Vornotation für laut-leise Preliminary exercises for loud - soft	Rondo S: Book Rondo-Platte- A 13-14 Record

HOLY SEE

SUMMARY REPORT

1. The Holy See has been sharing actively in CDCC's Project No. 8 on "Innovation in Primary Education".

In particular it has:

1.1 followed the activities concerned with the project closely and taken action during their various stages through its two central dicasteries - the Office of the Secretary of State and the Congregation for Catholic Education - as well as through the Office of its Permanent Representative to the Council of Europe;

1.2 appointed Sister Maria Marchi, of the Pontifical Faculty of Education Sciences, "AUXILIUM", in Rome, as a permanent member of Project Group No. 8;

1.3 kept abreast of the various symposiums, seminars, workshops, etc by sending its own experts to them;

1.4 participated, with a qualified delegation, in the Final Conference on the project, held at Nice at the end of 1987.

2. The project findings have been closely studied by the two above-mentioned central dicasteries.

3. The Congregation for Catholic Education intends to make the results of the project known through its official journal "SEMINARIUM".

4. No seminars specifically devoted to the question have been organised, since Catholic schools will be informed by the local education authorities of the countries in which they are situated.

5. Later, the results will be made known at the two Pontifical Faculties of Education Sciences in Rome: the "AUXILIUM" and the "SALESIANA".

The first mentioned institution has already given information about the project in its periodical "LA RIVISTA DI SCIENZE DELL'EDUCAZIONE" (the Educational Sciences Review); the other will be doing so as soon as possible through its review "ORIENTAMENTI PEDAGOGICI" (Pedagogical Orientations). In addition, the project material will be made available to the staff and students of the two faculties, which are international in character, and it will be duly dealt with in the courses.

Professor Guglielmo Malizia

ICELAND

Dissemination activities of the results of CDCC's Project No. 8 on Innovation in Primary Education

1. National Seminar:

Innovation in Primary Education. Dissemination of the CDCC's Project No. 8 in Iceland, 19-20 May 1988.

Main lectures:

Monica Gather Thurler: The primary school in a changing world. The internal pressure. New knowledge about child development.

Gerard van den Hoven: The new primary school in Holland.

Sigrídur Jónsdóttir: Project No. 8. Description of the project, methods, reports, results and recommendations.

Participants from:

The Teachers' Training College,
The University of Iceland
The College of Pre-School Teachers,
The National Centre for Educational Materials,
The Teachers' Union,
The Local Educational Authorities and the Ministry of Education.

2. Introduction at:

- Meeting with headteachers in Reykjavik.
- Meetings of Directors of Studies at the Ministry of Education.
- Seminars for educators on school development, held by the Teachers' Union.
- Several meetings with teachers.

3. Translation into Icelandic:

"Innovation in Primary Education", a notebook by M.G.T. and D.K.

The results and recommendations from the Final Report.

These reports will be distributed to all schools and educational institutions.

4. The results have had effect on the new National Syllabus and curricula which have been revised and are now being introduced in Icelandic schools.

5. Short articles in newspapers.

Sigrídur Jónsdóttir
Inspector, the Ministry
of Culture and Education

IRELAND

"Dissemination of information on Project No. 8"

Memo from Mr Liam O'Heigearta (Divisional Inspector), Department of Education, Dublin

In Ireland, information on Project No. 8 is disseminated in the following ways:

1. Report of delegates to conferences and meetings

Delegates to conferences and meetings on Project No. 8 are required to submit reports on the proceedings. These reports are given consideration at the appropriate level in the Department of Education.

2. Links with the Curriculum Unit of the Department of Education

Delegates to conferences and meetings on Project No. 8 are members of the Standing Committee of the Curriculum Unit of the Department of Education. The implications in delegates' reports for curriculum review and development in Ireland may be discussed at meetings of the Standing Committee.

3. Address of Dr. Dook Kopmels to the Annual Conference of the Primary Schools' Inspectors

Dr. Dook Kopmels has kindly accepted an invitation to address the Annual Conference of the Primary Schools' Inspectors in Dublin on 7 December 1988. By way of preparation, all primary schools' inspectors have already been sent copies of three major reports on Project No. 8. Dr. Kopmels' lecture will be followed by lengthy discussions, aimed at clarifying the possible relevance which the findings of the project might have for primary education in Ireland.

4. (a) Review Body on the Primary Curriculum (1987-1989)

(b) Review Body on Primary Education (1987-1989)

These two review bodies were set up by the Minister for Education about one year ago. The Review Body on the Primary Curriculum is engaged in analysing the aims and objectives of the present primary curriculum, in assessing the extent of their implementation since 1971 and in making recommendations for the future. The Review Body on Primary Education is charged with the responsibility of reviewing all other aspects of the primary education sector in Ireland. Both bodies comprise representatives of teachers', parents' and management

organisations, local education interests, teacher educators and staff of the Department of Education. Following Dr. Kopmel's presentation on 7 December, its implications for the work of the Review Bodies will be considered by the Department of Education staff involved.

Liam Ó'Héigearta
(Divisional Inspector)
Department of Education
Dublin
IRELAND

24 October 1988

ITALY

Ministry of Education, Rome, October 1988

Project No 8: Dissemination of results

1. Regular progress reports on Project No. 8 have been sent to the minister and relevant directors.

2. At the ministry's instigation, an extract from the final report was published in the official review, "Annali della Pubblica Istruzione", no. 2, 1988 (first part - the second will appear in due course).

3. At the instigation of the Civitavecchia Education Department and the C. Laurenti School, Civitavecchia, a book is being prepared on the contact school network and the Italian education system. It will be sent to a number of Italian schools.

4. At my suggestion as Italian member of the project group, a proposal will be made to the minister for a national conference in 1989 to present the final report to the Italian primary school inspectorate.

Corrado Candidi,
member of Project Group No 8

LUXEMBOURG

Dissemination of the results of Project No. 8

1. A draft revision of the primary school curriculum has just been completed. It was simultaneous with Project No. 8 and therefore took into account the recommendations and findings of the final report.

2. For teachers' information it is planned to publish the project's main findings and recommendations in a special number of the "Courrier de l'Education nationale", the ministry's official publication, which goes out to teachers and others involved in education.

3. It is planned to hold an internal seminar on Project No. 8 and its possible implications for primary education in Luxembourg.

Jean-Pierre Oestreicher
Francis Hierzig

October 1988

MALTA

A number of measures and activities have already been taken while others are being planned for the purposes of disseminating and publicising the results of Project No. 8 of the Council for Cultural Co-operation (CDCC). These include:

1. National Seminar for Heads of Primary Schools convened in Malta from 9-13 May 1988

A national seminar for heads of primary schools on "Dissemination of the results of CDCC's Project No. 8" was organised by the Primary Sector of the Education Department with the help and collaboration of the School Education Division of the Council of Europe. This was in consonance with the strategies advocated by the project group for disseminating the results of the project and for its follow-up. Headteachers from both state and private primary schools attended the seminar as well as competent authorities, educationalists and teacher trainers. The aim of the seminar was devoted to the main findings, conclusions and recommendations of the project as well as the implementation at national level of the principles enshrined in its Final Report.

The undersigned was entrusted with the organisation of the meeting and helped by Education Officers of the primary sector. A special word of thanks and appreciation goes to Ms Giulia Podestà, Head of the School Education Division of the Council of Europe, who notwithstanding her many other commitments, found time to attend the seminar and to take an active role in its planning and organisation. Her interest in our efforts, encouragement and unfailing support is most appreciated.

Mr Patrick Lavin, Divisional Inspector, Curriculum Unit, of the Department of Education in Ireland and Dr. Antonis Papadopoulos, Inspector of Primary Education, Nicosia, Cyprus, accepted the Council of Europe's invitation to lecture at this seminar. The former focused his talks on curriculum development with particular reference to science and new technologies, while the latter lectured on the theme of the head of school as an innovation agent in primary education.

A detailed draft report on the above-named seminar is available for perusal. The Final Report will be distributed to all member states in the near future.

2. In-service courses for primary school teachers

A number of in-service courses for primary school teachers were held during the past scholastic year with a view to keeping teachers abreast of new developments in primary education. The courses included art, science, physical education, music and the use of teaching aids. All courses focused their attention on recent innovations, suggestions and recommendations as defined by Project No. 8.

3. The media

Educational films and video tapes will shortly be replacing the out-dated School Broadcasting Unit. Towards this end screens and recorders have been supplied to all primary schools. A video library has been set up and is being administered by the Media Education Centre. Topics on all subjects of the primary school curriculum have been included.

4. Curriculum development

As a result of society's growing expectations, primary schools are having to cope with an ever-increasing range of curriculum demands.

Confronted with these new requirements, the Hon. Minister of Education set up a "Primary Schools Curriculum Committee" with the undersigned as Deputy Chairman. The terms of reference are the following:

i. to recommend the content of the primary education and the suggested time allocations for the different areas of study;

ii. to recommend the proper approaches to teaching in primary schools;

iii. to explore the possibility of elaborating different curricula for different levels of ability. Work is proceeding at a steady rate and is envisaged to be completed by the end of this calendar year.

5. The primary school syllabus

The primary school syllabus is also being revised and given a new format.

6. Parents' associations

Co-operation between parents and the school has been further strengthened. Parents are being encouraged to have greater involvement in school affairs and in the education of their children. As a result better continuity exists between the education received at home and at school.

7. Integration of handicapped children in primary schools

A considerable number of children who previously attended special schools have now been integrated in primary schools. A psychological team has been set up to monitor progress and give the required help to both teachers and pupils. In such classes, the teacher pupil ratio has been decreased and extra help provided.

8. Printing and distribution of the 'Final Report' of Project No. 8

On the recommendations of the conference at Nice (30 November - 2 December), the Final Report of Project No. 8 was printed and distributed to all primary schools - both state and private. Copies

were sent to the Ministry of Education, the Faculty of Education, University of Malta, the news media and the Malta Union of Teachers. A summary of the report was also drawn up by the undersigned. Copies of the above reports are available for perusal.

9. Remedial education

The Department of Education is re-establishing remedial education at the primary level. Remedial education is regarded as that part of education which is concerned with the prevention, investigation and treatment of learning difficulties from whatever source they may emanate and which hinder the educational development of students in ordinary schools.

Towards this end, the Hon. Minister of Education recently had a lengthy discussion with policy makers while it was decided to introduce this added help during the most crucial years of the child's life at school. The schools will operate the withdrawal system, whereby children are withdrawn from their class for short regular lessons given by a full time remedial teacher and given individual help in the tool subjects. When the class teacher in consultation with the remedial teacher sees that a child has caught up with his peers in the mainstream that child is not sent for further remedial lessons and can be replaced by another child considered in need of individual help.

10. In-service course for heads and assistant heads of primary schools - November/December 1988

Objectives

This course is aimed at helping all those in an administrative position to critically analyse both problems and possibilities of school development within their own schools.

It aims at presenting school development as a process by which the members of the institution develop: the capacity to reflect on the nature and purpose of their work together.

It presents an approach, a strategy where school administrators, as effective leaders, become increasingly committed to a style of collaborative management.

The ultimate aim of the course being that headteachers and assistant heads (Administration and Heads of Department) would be in a position to conduct their own school development programmes.

Michael C Sultana
Assistant Director of Education
Primary, Special and Kindergarten Schools

PORTUGAL

Dissemination of the results of CDCC Project No 8, "Innovation in primary education"

At the instigation of the Portuguese Ministry of Education, the Directorate General for Basic and Secondary Education held a national seminar at Lisbon on 28 and 29 September 1988 on the results of Project No 8.

The seminar was attended by Mrs Giulia Podestà, Head of the School Education Division, Directorate for Education, Culture and Sport, Council of Europe, Professor Jean-Pierre Oestreicher, Luxembourg member of the project group, and Mrs Maria Helena Valente Rosa, vice-chairman of the project group.

Mrs Podestà described the project's place in the CDCC's educational work and said that radical curricular reform and an overhaul of initial and in-service teacher training were basic prerequisites of successful primary-school innovation.

Professor Oestreicher outlined the project and its progress and explained the project's main findings and recommendations.

All the Ministry of Education bodies concerned with primary education were represented at the seminar:

the General Inspectorate of Education;

the Directorate General for Basic and Secondary Education;

regional education departments;

the Directorate General for Educational Support and Extension;

the Institute for Educational Technology;

the Institute for School Welfare Action;

the Institute for Educational Innovation;

the Research and Planning Office;

schools of education;

the integrated centres for teacher training;

the Regional Education Offices of the autonomous regions of Madeira and the Azores.

The seminar was also attended by representatives of:

associations of private schools;

the parent associations union;

the teaching union.

Portugal began reform of its education system in 1986 when the National Assembly passed Law No 46/86 (the Basic Education Act), which extended the length of compulsory schooling to 9 years and many of whose principles and provisions incorporated innovative features advocated by the Council of Europe.

In Portugal's case, therefore, Project No 8's findings and recommendations come just at the right time.

The State Secretary for education reform, who chaired the seminar, pointed out that Portugal's education system is currently receptive to qualitative change and educational innovation though he stressed that innovation needed to be in line with the fundamental aims of basic education, the curriculum, syllabuses and the community education approach.

Such innovation required commitment at all levels of educational administration and could not be carried through without teacher training.

Over the two days of plenaries and discussions a large number of specialists helped put across the essentials of the project, relating it to current developments in educational reform.

The Director General for Basic and Secondary Education gave a brief account of the primary education system, drawing attention to a number of difficulties there and to experiments which many teachers had instigated.

Teacher training, organisational innovation at primary school with reference to the Basic Education Act, and innovation for educational success were the topics the various specialists addressed.

There was a consensus that teachers had to be active and effective participants in the whole innovation process.

Summing up the seminar, Mr Carlos Vicente, Head of the Primary Education Department, said speakers had focused on two things:

- the new primary school;
- the teacher-training necessary for introducing the new approach.

It was concluded that Project No. 8 had an undoubted contribution to make to development of the Portuguese education system and to bringing the system more into line with society's needs and the requirements of child development.

It is planned to follow up the seminar with workshops and further seminars to disseminate the results of the project. The final report, conclusions and recommendations will all be translated so that they can be widely circulated to teachers, who are the main agents of innovation.

The Ministry of Education's various agencies and the teacher training colleges will undoubtedly be mounting further initiatives.

SWITZERLAND

Dissemination of the results of CDCC Project No 8 in Switzerland

CDCC Project No. 8, "Innovation in primary education", coincided with SIPRI, a major intercantonal project in Switzerland to review Swiss primary education.

Right from the opening symposium at Vaduz (9-12 november 1982), close links were forged between the two projects: key members of the Swiss project took part in the Council of Europe project and one of the SIPRI schools, Guthirt School, Zug, was one of the CDCC project's contact schools.

These links are undoubtedly the reason why educational development in Switzerland in recent years has been influenced by the Council of Europe project. We would venture to suggest, however, that the converse is also true: ideas developed within the SIPRI project were fed into Project No. 8 by its Swiss members and in turn influenced Project No. 8's development and results.

After the final conference, in Nice, the Swiss participants set about disseminating the results of Project No. 8 to various target groups in Swiss education planning, research and development. The three main channels of dissemination were as follows:

Short reports describing the aims, content and organisation of the project were issued together with the final report in a kind of newsletter (the "feuilles bleues") and widely circulated in the relevant quarters by the Federal Department for Education and Science.

Two of the project members, Monica Gather Thurler and her Dutch colleague, Dook Kopmels, produced a "popular" version of the final report. This was aimed at education authorities, administrators, teachers and parents and set out to be a readable and attractively produced précis of the key ideas in the final report. It came out in two of our national languages (German and French) and was widely circulated. We now know it was successful and has been adopted in initial and in-service training.

Lastly, the Conference of Swiss Cantonal Directors of State Education held a seminar at Montreux on 22-24 August 1989 which was exclusively devoted to the results of Project No. 8. The Swiss members of the project took particular care over the seminar preparations so as to create the right conditions for placing the European findings in the context of Swiss educational realities.

The declared aims of the seminar were to:

- acquaint the participants with the main results of the Council of Europe project;
- use the experience accumulated through the European project to draw comparisons with key aspects of education innovation projects in Switzerland and discuss similarities and differences;

- evaluate Swiss projects and decide whether it was necessary or possible to adjust content or strategy.

The seminar was attended by members of the Pedagogical Committee of the Conference of Directors of State Education, heads and partners of cantonal and regional educational research and co-ordination services, officials of cantonal state education departments, and representatives of teachers' associations.

The seminar had support from the Council of Europe, which enabled five foreign specialists to attend: Don Hollingsworth (United Kingdom), Peter Honeth (Sweden), Sigridur Jönsdöttir (Iceland), Dook Kopmels (Netherlands) and Jean-Michel Sivirine (France).

The format was as follows:

The foreign specialists were given a brief description of a Swiss primary-education reform project and asked to describe a similar current project in their own countries, and to relate the results of Project No. 8 to the innovation project in their own countries and the Swiss reform project.

This took up three half-days of group discussion. A further half-day was devoted to management of innovation schemes at local level.

To evaluate, the seminar was largely successful in that we had the benefit of the results of an international project and the presence of foreign specialists as a stimulus to reflection about and discussion of primary education innovation in Switzerland. Discussion of the intercantonal in-service teacher training project was particularly intensive, and in the light of the experience and results of Project No. 8 it was possible to pinpoint numerous promising avenues for the intercantonal project's short-term and longer-term work.

The participants were impressed with the Project No. 8 specialists, particularly their competence and empathy. Communication (the official languages of the seminar were German, French and English) was no problem and this favourably impressed the foreign specialists. These factors - among others - prompted most of the participants to revise their view - at least as far as Project No. 8 was concerned - that the cost of international projects is out of all proportion to the results.

Despite this, on the whole, positive outcome, we have to face the fact that innovation at local level will continue encountering obstacles in Switzerland, particularly as the differences between German-speaking and French-speaking Switzerland are still considerable as regards "innovation style". The reactions to some of the seminar programme, led by Dook Kopmels, confirm that impression: whereas the German-speaking participants reacted enthusiastically, some of the French-speaking participants were critical of the suggested approach, and indeed rejected it.

What are the immediate prospects? In 10 months or so, the organisers of the Montreux seminar are planning to conduct a survey of the seminar participants, to ask them what effect the Montreux seminar has had on their work this year and whether they think a follow-up seminar would be useful.

Other dissemination activities of varying scope are in progress. Although we cannot give details of all of them, the significant thing to note is that we have succeeded in getting the message across to the rank and file - surely one of the main recommendations of the final report?!

Zurich, September 1988
Werner Heller
Translation by Monica Gather Thurler

UNITED KINGDOM

Dissemination of Project No. 8

At this stage the dissemination of the report is only just beginning. It may be related to the very nature of such reports - which address such a broad topic as innovation - they are not easily or swiftly taken up and given attention. In the United Kingdom there are, at present, many major changes which are to be brought into effect as a result of the Education Reform Act of July 1988. The English system must respond in a relatively short time scale to directives which introduce a national curriculum; give individual schools the responsibility for their own financial management - including the salaries of teachers; allow the formation of grant maintained schools standing separate from the control of the local educational authorities. With the work load of these statutory changes in mind it is not surprising that there has been little reaction to the report of Project No. 8 up to this point. The influence of the Project may well take time to emerge and may flow through some indirect routes.

Copies of the full report have been sent to senior members of the inspectorate.

Copies of chapter 4, ie the main findings have been sent out to all the primary specialists (approximately 60 HMI) within the inspectorate and used as a basis for lectures to teachers.

Copies have been sent to some teacher-training establishments.

In the first week of November the International Relations Branch of DES is to hold a meeting to discuss its view of the report and its proposals for further dissemination.

Don Hollingsworth, HMI

SLOVENIA - YUGOSLAVIA

Even though Yugoslavia did not participate in Project No. 8, we had several activities which pursued the same goal. I would like to point out two projects: first, the introduction of natural sciences in pre-school education (A Kornhauser) and second, developing creativity in elementary school (N Jausovec). The aim of the second project was to design a teaching programme to enhance creativity in the regular curriculum at the elementary school. 238 children from four schools in Maribor participated in this project. The results indicate that the teaching method influenced children's convergent and divergent abilities (changes in the heuristic structure).

This project is now introduced into a greater number of elementary schools in Slovenia with a consultancy and a course development approach.

The dissemination of results of Project No. 8 and some current Slovene educational initiatives

We can divide them into three groups:

1. Symposiums dedicated to innovations in the elementary school. (The gifted child in the educational process, Maribor 1987; The second International Symposium: Natural Sciences in pre-school and early elementary education, Portoroz, 1988; I. Conference of Slovene Pedagogs Maribor, 1988)

   Since Slovenia is organising the XII International School Psychology Colloquium (18-22 August 1989) it would be possible to submit the results of Project No. 8.

2. Publications. The symposiums' lectures were published in special editions. Our national publishing company (DZS) is also publishing a serial edition dedicated to innovations in elementary school.

3. Regular and permanent teacher's education. The dissemination of Project No. 8's findings during regular and permanent teacher's education organised by the following institutes: Pedagogical Faculty of Maribor and Ljubljana and the Pedagogical Institute.